

**Department of Navy and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Section 7 Consultations for the  
Military Relocation to Guam**

**Meeting Minutes for October 26, 2016**

**Meeting by phone call**

**Participants:**

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)

(b) (6)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Honolulu Office

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Honolulu Office

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Honolulu Office

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland Office

Department of Navy (DON)

(b) (6)

Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (EI&E)

Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (EI&E)

Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (EI&E)

Quarters, U.S. Marine Corps (LF/MCICOM GF)

Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (EI&E)

**Status of Meeting Minutes from the August 23-24, 2016 FWS and DON Meeting in Hawaii**

The purpose of the meeting minutes is to have a common understanding and a reference of topics discussed and decisions agreed upon during the meeting. Draft meeting minutes were provided by DON to FWS on September 26, 2016 for review and comment.

Most of the personnel at the FWS had not had a chance to read and review the meeting minutes from the Hawaii Aug 2016 meeting, however (b) (6) reviewed them and did not see any issues. The FWS agreed to review and provide any comments.

**Fence at LFTRC**

FWS - The FWS agrees that the fence that goes around the LFTRC will keep out ungulates, however the original fence (from ISR Strike) was intended as mitigation for impacts to fruit bat and kingfishers and not for butterflies. The FWS expressed concern with language in the draft meeting minutes for the Hawaii Aug 2016 meeting that indicated that if DON put up a fence around the LFTRC, it would mitigate for the ISR Strike potential future impacts to kingfisher and bats, and also mitigate for impacts from this action to butterflies. FWS requested that the meeting minutes be revised as they did not intend to imply that.

DON – DON provided that the FWS had stated during the Hawaii meeting that if the fence was erected around the LFTRC that it may resolve the ISR Strike mitigation issue as well as may provide mitigation for the potential impacts to butterflies. However, DON agreed to modify the meeting minutes notes to reflect FWS clarification of what they said. DON reiterated that the proposed fence (by DON) to replace the ISR Strike fence will create a larger, ungulate free area than what is currently in place. DON offered to provide the delta on the land area.

FWS – The FWS will provide their recommended edits to the meeting minutes on this subject.

#### **Butterfly Rearing**

FWS – The FWS requested the DON provide documentation of the status of the work that is going on as FWS get slightly different answers depending on who they talk to. Is it possible to get an update from (b) (6) research, challenges and accomplishments?

DON – The DON agreed to include any information that they could get access to as part of the package that will be provided to the FWS for the butterfly.

#### **Mariana Fruit Bats**

DON - DON inquired about the status of the Mariana fruit bat amendment previously discussed during the Aug 2016 meeting in Hawaii. Based on discussions with (b) (6) in Hawaii, the DON believes that this was completed or near completion as a separate consultation (possibly Feb 2016). The DON recommends that we continue with the adjustment on the Mariana fruit bat section as a separate consultation.

FWS – The FWS agreed with the approach, and suggested that the Mariana fruit amendment may already be complete and that FWS will provide to DON.

#### **Revised Re-Initiation**

FWS – The FWS agreed to identifying Phase II Data submission as a "revised re-initiation package" and concurred with the edits to the assumptions section as the topics are captured in the schedule section.

DON - The DON requested clarification and expectations on what to include in the revised re-initiation package. Does the FWS have a concern or desire to have all information in one document? Does the FWS want the DON to re-state the action if it has not changed?

FWS – The FWS noted that they do have information from the last BO as well as previously submitted documents; however, the FWS requested that the DON explicitly state the action and the conservation measures in the revised re-initiation package. The FWS understands that there may not have been a change and that the DON may reference a previous document, however, the DON needs to ensure that the FWS has the same version of the older document and that the FWS is able to easily find the older document. The FWS believes it would be easier for DON to just include that information in the revised re-initiation package to ensure that the FWS knows what the DON is stating and to increase the efficiency and clarity of the FWS analysis.

DON – The DON understood the FWS position, although inclusion of previous language in the document did not align with the DON's original thinking and it may take more time and effort than initially planned.

#### **Phase I Data Submission**

FWS – The FWS asked when DON will provide the Phase I data submission.

DON – The DON is hoping to provide the Phase I data submission next week. The DON wants to ensure that the data is 100% correct before the DON provides to the FWS.